

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 9, 2002. Claims 1-17 are presented for examination. No claims have been amended in this Response. Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12, and 15 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

First, Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of Claims 1-11.

The Office Action rejected Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,196,366 (Yamazaki et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Office Action rejected Claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Yamazaki et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,470,265 (Nomura et al.); Claim 12 as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,410,144 (Dearnaley et al.); and Claims 13 and 14 as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. in view of Dearnaley et al. and further in view of U.S. 5,470,265 (Nomura et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants submit that independent Claims 12 and 15, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art at least for the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 12 is an electron-emitting device that includes a carbon film composed chiefly of carbon and an electrode electrically connected to the carbon film. In this device, sulfur is contained in the carbon film in a rate of 1 mol% or more with respect to carbon.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 15 is an electron-emitting device that includes a carbon film composed chiefly of carbon and an electrode electrically connected to the carbon film. In this device, sulfur is contained in the carbon film.

An important feature of both Claim 12 and Claim 15 is that the device is directed to an electron-emitting device.

Yamazaki et al., as understood by Applicants, relates to a method of manufacturing electric devices. The Office Action states that Yamazaki et al. "discloses a *light-emitting* [emphasis added] device including diamond crystals (2), a substrate (1), and an electrode (7) electrically connected to the diamond layer." In contrast, the device of Applicants' Claim 15 is directed to an *electron-emitting* device, not a light-emitting device as in Yamazaki et al, and Applicants have found nothing in Yamazaki et al. that would teach or suggest an electron-emitting device to emit electrons, as recited in Claim 15. Applicants further submit that the features of the invention in Yamazaki et al. could not be used to emit electrons. Accordingly, Applicants submit that at least for this reason, Claim 15 is patentable over Yamazaki et al.

Dearnaley et al., as understood by Applicants, relates to lubricious diamond-like carbon coatings. The Office Action states that Dearnaley et al. is in "the same field of diamond films containing sulfur," apparently compared to the light-emitting device discussed above in Yamazaki et al. Similar to Applicants' discussion above regarding Claim 15, Applicants submit that the device of Applicants' Claim 12 is directed to an *electron-emitting* device, not a light-emitting device as in Yamazaki et al and Dearnaley et al. Accordingly,

Applicants submit that at least for this reason, Claim 12 is patentable over the proposed combination of Yamazaki et al. and Dearnaley et al.

A review of the other art of record including Nomura et al. has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other rejected claims in this application are each dependent from Claim 12 or Claim 15 and are therefore believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter G. Thauler
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 47,138

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 33333v1



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

[Home](#)[Index](#)[Search](#)[System Alerts](#)[eBusiness Center](#)[News & Notices](#)[Contact Us](#)

Amendments in a Revised Format Now Permitted

Office of Patent Legal Administration << Pre-OG Notices << << Amendments in a Revised Format Now Permitted

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO or Office) is permitting applicants to submit amendments in a revised format as set forth herein. The revised amendment format is essentially the same as the amendment format that the Office is considering adopting via a revision to 37 CFR 1.121 (Manner of Making Amendments). The revision to 37 CFR 1.121 (if adopted) will simplify amendment submission and improve file management. The Office plans to adopt such a revision to 37 CFR 1.121 by July of 2003, at which point compliance with revised 37 CFR 1.121 will be mandatory.

The revised amendment format is an expansion of the special amendment process instituted for a prototype Electronic File Wrapper program described in USPTO ANNOUNCES PROTOTYPE OF IMAGE PROCESSING, 1265 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 87 (Dec. 17, 2002) ("Prototype Announcement"). The special amendment process (which was limited to claims) has proven overwhelmingly acceptable to applicants participating in the prototype and beneficial to examiners. The revised amendment format provides for amendments to be made to the specification and the drawings in addition to the claims.

Effective immediately, **all** applicants, including applicants participating in the prototype, may submit amendments using the revised amendment format set forth herein. Applicants may wish to submit all amendments in the revised amendment format because: (1) it will facilitate transition to a revised amendment format when it becomes mandatory, (2) inconsistent versions of claim amendments (clean and marked-up) will be avoided, and (3) time and resources will be saved.

WAIVER of 37 CFR 1.121

The provisions of 37 CFR 1.121(a), (b), (c) and (d) are waived for amendments to the **claims, specification, and drawings** in all applications in all Technology Centers where the amendments comply with the revised amendment format detailed below. Note: The revised amendment format (and the waiver) does **not** apply to 37 CFR 1.121(h) and (i) which indicate that amendments to reissue applications and reexamination proceedings are governed by 37 CFR 1.173 for reissue applications and 37 CFR 1.530 (d)-(k) for *ex parte* and *inter partes* reexaminations.

In addition, the WAIVER indicated in the above mentioned Prototype Announcement for the limited (claims only) amendment process of that prototype is also expressly continued and amendments in applications (other than reissue applications) in all Technology Centers that comply with the requirements in that announcement will be acceptable.

REVISED AMENDMENT FORMAT**I. Begin Sections on Separate Sheets:**

Each section of an amendment paper (e.g., Amendments to the Specification, Amendments to the Claims, Remarks) shall begin on a separate sheet to facilitate separate indexing and electronic scanning of the document.

For example, each of the following four sections of an amendment paper must start on a separate sheet:

- a.) Introductory Comments

- b.) Amendments to the Specification
- c.) Amendments to the Claims
- d.) Remarks

II. Submit Only One Version (with markings) of an Amended Part:

The requirement to provide two versions of a replacement paragraph, section, or claim (a clean version and a marked up version), as set forth in current 37 CFR 1.121, is waived where the format set forth below is followed.

III. Amendments to the Claims**A. A Complete Listing of Claims is Always Required:**

If an amendment adds, changes or deletes any claim, a detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remains under examination in the application, must be presented, and the amendment to the claims is expressed in the listing. The listing shall be presented as follows:

1. Ascending Order and Status Identifier Required

The listing shall be provided in sequential ascending numerical order (beginning with claim 1). A status identifier shall be provided for every claim in a parenthetical expression following the claim number (e.g., "Claim 1. (original)"). A list of acceptable status identifiers is set forth in part B, below. The text of **all** claims under examination shall be submitted each time any claim is amended. Cancelled and withdrawn claims should be indicated by only the claim number and status. The text of cancelled or withdrawn claims should not be presented.

2. Markings in Currently Amended Claims Required

All claims *being currently amended* shall be submitted with markings to indicate the changes that have been made relative to the immediate prior version of the claims. The changes in any amended claim should be shown by strikethrough (for deleted matter) or underlining (for added matter). No separate "clean" version should be submitted for currently amended claims, as this requirement has been eliminated. **Markings should only be made in claims being currently amended in an amendment paper.**

3. Only Clean Text Required for Other Claims Under Examination.

The text of pending claims *not being currently amended* that are under examination shall be presented in a clean version in the listing. Any claim presented in clean version constitutes an assertion that it has not been changed relative to the immediate prior version.

4. Status to Effect Claim Cancellation or Addition.

A claim may be cancelled by merely indicating the status of the claim as cancelled. Any new claim added by amendment must be indicated by the appropriate status identifier and shall not be underlined. Thus, added new claims of status (new), (reinstated - formerly claim #_) and (re-presented - formerly dependent claim #_) must be presented in clean version. Additional claims may be subject to additional fees, as appropriate.

5. When Grouping of Claims is Permitted.

Consecutive cancelled or withdrawn claims may be aggregated into one line of the listing (e.g. Claims 1 - 5 (cancelled)).

6. Use "Currently Amended" Status Where Applicable.

If any "previously reinstated" or "previously re-presented" claim is being amended, the status shall be indicated as "currently amended" with markings as indicated in paragraph A2, above. Multiple status identifiers should not be used for any single claim.

B. Status Identifiers that May be Used:

In order to promote uniformity and consistency, only the following eleven (11) defined status identifiers should be used to indicate the status of the claims (in parentheses after the claim number):

1. (Original):	Claim filed with the application following the specification (i.e., not added by preliminary amendment).
2. (Currently amended):	Claim being amended in the current amendment paper.
3. (Previously amended):	Claim not being currently amended, but which was amended in a previous amendment paper.
4. (Cancelled):	Claim cancelled or deleted from the application.
5. (Withdrawn):	Claim still in the application, but in a non-elected status.
6. (Previously added):	Claim added in an earlier amendment paper.
7. (New):	Claim being added in the current amendment paper.
8. (Reinstated - formerly claim # _):	Claim deleted in an earlier amendment paper, but re-presented with a new claim number in current amendment.
9. (Previously reinstated):	Claim deleted in an earlier amendment and reinstated in an earlier amendment paper.
10. (Re-presented - formerly dependent claim # _):	Dependent claim re-presented in independent form in current amendment paper.
11. (Previously re-presented):	Dependent claim re-presented in independent form in an earlier amendment, but not currently amended.

C. Example of Listing of Claims:

Claims 1-5 (cancelled)
Claim 6 (withdrawn)
Claim 7 (previously amended): A bucket with a handle.
Claim 8 (currently amended): A bucket with a ~~green~~ blue handle.
Claim 9 (withdrawn)
Claim 10 (original): A bucket with a wooden handle.
Claim 11 (cancelled)

Claim 12 (new): A bucket with plastic sides and bottom.

Claim 13 (previously added): A bucket having a circumferential upper lip.

Claim 14 (re-presented - formerly claim 11): A black bucket with a wooden handle.

IV. Amendments to the Specification

Amendments to the specification are to be made by presenting replacement paragraphs, sections or a substitute specification marked up to show changes made relative to the immediate prior version, as set out in 37 CFR 1.121(b). The changes should be shown by strikethrough (for deleted matter) or underlining (for added matter). No accompanying "clean" version shall be supplied. The amendments to the specification shall be presented only one time, and will not appear in successive amendment documents.

V. Amendments to the Drawings

Amendments to the drawing figures shall be made by presenting replacement figures which include the desired changes, without markings, and which comply with § 1.84. The changes shall be explained in the accompanying remarks section of the amendment paper. If the amended drawings are not approved, the applicant will be notified in the next Office action. Any amended drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even though only one figure may be amended. The figure number in the amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended."

For further information on the prototype image electronic processing of patent applications, please contact the Search and Information Resources Administration at: image.processing@uspto.gov. Any questions regarding the submission of amendments pursuant to the revised practice set forth in this notice should be directed to Elizabeth Dougherty (Elizabeth.Dougherty@uspto.gov), Gena Jones (Eugenia.Jones@uspto.gov) or Joe Narcavage (mailto:Joseph.Narcavage@uspto.gov). For information on the waiver or legal aspects of the program, please contact Jay Lucas (Jay.Lucas@uspto.gov) or Rob Clarke (Robert.Clarke@uspto.gov).

Date: 1/31/03

Signed: /s/

STEPHEN KUNIN
Deputy Commissioner for Patent
Examination Policy

[HOME](#) | [INDEX](#) | [SEARCH](#) | [SYSTEM STATUS](#) | [BUSINESS CENTER](#) | [NEWS&NOTICES](#)
| [CONTACT US](#) | [PRIVACY STATEMENT](#)

Last Modified: 02/24/2003 15:15:41